

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims 56-61, 63-65, 67-68, 90 and 92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because these claims allegedly claim a computer program product comprising a computer readable medium. Applicants have amended claim 56, 90, 92 and 99. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 89-99 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 55-61, 63-65, 67-68, 90 and 92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants have amended the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 13, 34-35, 55, 89, 91 and 94 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Jouppi et al. in view of Van Hook. Applicants have amended the claims to indicate that the method and apparatus include retrieving tiles of pixel data and resizing the tiles to a different size prior to compression. Evaluation occurs to determine whether the resized tiles can undergo partial compression, full compression or no compression, for example. Other claims indicate that the evaluation determines whether the resized tiles can undergo partial compression along with other operations. Support may be found for example, among other places, in pages 21-24 of Applicants' Specification. The resizing operation does not appear to be taught or suggested in the cited portion of any of the references. Such a system can allow larger tiles in main memory to be bigger and hence requiring fewer entries in, for example, a primary TFT. This can reduce the size of the primary TFT in valuable on-processor memory space. A secondary TFT tracking the resized tiles in a cache can require fewer entries so that overall memory savings on a processor can be achieved (see Specification, page 22 and elsewhere).

Since the references do not appear to teach the subject matter, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

In addition, other claims have been amended to indicate that the processing can take place using the compressed tiles. Support may be found, for example, on page 20 and elsewhere of Applicants' Specification. For example, a processor can operate on the tile in its compressed format to speed up overall operation. The compression format can be tracked so that the single cycle can be used, for example, instead of four cycles to blend new shapes against four samples per pixel. (See Specification, page 24).

Claims 6, 12, 56-61, 63-65, 67-68, 90 and 92 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being referenced obvious by Jouppi et al. and Van Hook in view of Molnar. Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 14, 2011

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005